

**ACTIVE CASES**  
**Analysis August 2003 QA Results for Food Stamps**

**Sample Size:** 91  
(drops excluded)

**Statewide Total August:**

Total Issuance in Sample:	\$14,679.00
Total Number Error Cases:	12
Error Amount Total:	\$ 819.00
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	5.6%
<b>FFY 2003 Error Rate YTD:</b>	<b>8.8%</b>

\*\*\*\*(13.1% of the total number of cases sampled were in error)\*\*\*\*

**Milwaukee County August:**

Total Issuance in Sample:	\$7,836.00
Tot Number of Error Cases:	7
Error Amount Total:	\$ 565.00
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	7.2 %
FFY 2003 Error Rate:	11.6%

**Rest of State- August:**

Total Issuance in Sample:	\$ 6,843.00
Total Number of Error Cases:	5
Error Amount Total:	\$ 254.00
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	3.7%
FFY 2003 Error Rate:	6.5%

**REDUCED REPORTING : (Phase 1)**

A review of error cases that in the best-case scenario would not be considered errors under the new reduced reporting rules shows the following results. The error rate for August would look like this:

- **Statewide Totals:**

Total Number Error Cases:	10	
Error Amount Total:	\$ 715.00	
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	4.8%	(Aug)

- **Milwaukee County Totals:** (under Phase 1 of Reduced Reporting)

Total Number of Error Cases:	5	
Error Amount Total:	\$461	
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	5.8%	(Aug)

- **Rest of State Totals** (under Phase 1 of Reduced Reporting)

Total Number of Error Cases:	5	
Error Amount Total:	\$ 254	
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	3.7%	(Aug)

\*\*\*\*\*

Statewide, of the 12 errors:

- **7** were agency preventable errors.
- **1** was “agency” (probably APE but some question on error source)
- **4** were client “failure to report” errors—two of which would likely not be considered errors under new reporting rules . The rest of the client errors would still be included as they all were either failure to report correct circumstances at application or review, or failure of the worker to act on reported changes correctly. )

**Overview of the errors and where they occurred:**

- The monthly state rate has continued to decline since February.
- **APES and “Agency”:** Of the 7 APES and 1 agency error: 4 were in Milwaukee, and 4 in balance of state.
- Type of APES and “agency” errors:
  - **1**-Child Support budgeting error at review
  - **2**-Self-Employment budgeting error
  - **1**-Medical Expense budgeting error
  - **2**-Failure to budget known earnings
  - **2**-Utility Expenses budgeting error
- **Client non-reporting (4):**
- Types of non-reporting errors:
  - **1** Failure to report all employment income
  - **2**-Failure to report pay rate increase (one exceeded 130% FPL)
  - **1**- Failure to report CS ended (was over \$100/mo)

**Trends or Possible Recommendations?**

- Positive downward trends.

- This month doesn't show as much positive effect of the reduced reporting rules because so many were errors caused by agencies on information they had or were required to collect at application or re-certification.

- 

**“Biggest Contributors: The two cases that caused the largest dollar errors for August 2003 (including client errors):**

- Milwaukee County, \$222 Agency Preventable Error: self-employment budgeting. There was nothing in the case record to indicate what the agency rationale was for their budget. None of the data QC collected (tax records) correlated with those figures. Corrected SE income exceeded gross income limits. Totally ineligible.
- Milwaukee County, \$131 Agency Preventable Error: agency worker failed to examine the DXQW wage screen at the interview. The client was working for two employers at the same time. One employer's wages were never budgeted.

mbw 01/06/04